REPORT OF THE AUDIT OF THE MONROE COUNTY SHERIFF

For The Year Ended December 31, 2005



CRIT LUALLEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

www.auditor.ky.gov

105 SEA HERO ROAD, SUITE 2 FRANKFORT, KY 40601-5404 TELEPHONE (502) 573-0050 FACSIMILE (502) 573-0067

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AUDIT EXAMINATION OF THE MONROE COUNTY SHERIFF

For The Year Ended December 31, 2005

The Auditor of Public Accounts has completed the Monroe County Sheriff's audit for the year ended December 31, 2005. Based upon the audit work performed, the financial statement presents fairly, in all material respects, the revenues, expenditures, and excess fees in conformity with the regulatory basis of accounting.

Financial Condition:

Excess fees decreased by \$10,653 from the prior year, resulting in no excess fees as of December 31, 2005. Revenues increased by \$38,072 from the prior year and expenditures increased by \$46,607.

Report Comments:

- The Sheriff Deposited \$9,055 To Supplement The Cost Of Operating His Office
- The Sheriff's Office Lacks Adequate Segregation Of Duties

Deposits:

The Sheriff's deposits were insured and collateralized by bank securities.

<u>CONTENTS</u> PAGE

Independent Auditor's Report	1
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS	3
Notes To Financial Statement	6
COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial	
STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS	15



The Honorable Wilbur Graves, Monroe County Judge/Executive Honorable Jerry Gee, Monroe County Sheriff Members of the Monroe County Fiscal Court

Independent Auditor's Report

We have audited the accompanying statement of revenues, expenditures, and excess fees regulatory basis of the Sheriff of Monroe County, Kentucky, for the year ended December 31, 2005. This financial statement is the responsibility of the Sheriff. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on this financial statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Audit Guide for County Fee Officials issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts, Commonwealth of Kentucky. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

As described in Note 1, the Sheriff's office prepares the financial statement on a regulatory basis of accounting that demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky, which is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In our opinion, the financial statement referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the revenues, expenditures, and excess fees of the Sheriff for the year ended December 31, 2005, in conformity with the regulatory basis of accounting described in Note 1.

In accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u>, we have also issued our report dated March 7, 2006, on our consideration of the Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.



The Honorable Wilbur Graves, Monroe County Judge/Executive Honorable Jerry Gee, Monroe County Sheriff Members of the Monroe County Fiscal Court

Based on the results of our audit, we have presented the accompanying comments and recommendations, included herein, which discuss the following report comments:

- The Sheriff Deposited \$9,055 To Supplement The Cost Of Operating His Office
- The Sheriff's Office Lacks Adequate Segregation Of Duties

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Sheriff and Fiscal Court of Monroe County, Kentucky, and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these interested parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Crit Luallen

Auditor of Public Accounts

Audit fieldwork completed - March 7, 2006

MONROE COUNTY JERRY GEE, SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS

For The Year Ended December 31, 2005

Revenues

Federal Grants		\$ 50,130
State - Kentucky Law Enforcement Foundation Program Fund		10,243
State Fees For Services: Finance and Administration Cabinet Cabinet For Human Resources House Bill 413 Payments Sheriff Security Service Jury Reimbursement	\$ 26,349 199 2,607 4,868 1,022	35,045
Circuit Court Clerk: Fines and Fees Collected		1,700
Fiscal Court		42,513
County Clerk - Delinquent Taxes		335
Commission On Taxes Collected		99,645
Fees Collected For Services: Auto Inspections Accident and Police Reports Serving Papers Carrying Concealed Deadly Weapon Permits Sheriff Add On Fees	6,873 168 11,589 4,785 16,250	39,665
Other: Miscellaneous		3,228
Interest Earned		660
Borrowed Money: State Advancement Bank Note	55,000 17,250	72,250
Total Revenues		355,414

MONROE COUNTY

JERRY GEE, SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Expenditures

Operating Expenditures and Capital Outlay:		
Personnel Services-		
Deputies' Salaries	\$ 89,627	
COPS Salaries	39,200	
KLEFPF Salaries	9,817	
Court Bailiff	15,704	
Contract Labor	1,224	
Employee Benefits-		
Employer's Share Social Security	3,649	
Employer's Share Retirement	2,559	
Employer Paid Health Insurance	4,555	
Contracted Services-		
Grant Expenses	1,591	
Materials and Supplies-		
Office Materials and Supplies	1,690	
Uniforms	671	
Auto Expense-		
Gasoline	24,278	
Maintenance and Repairs	14,615	
Other Charges-		
Dues	50	
Postage	111	
HB 577 County Portion	3,200	
Bond	619	
Carrying Concealed Deadly Weapon Permits	3,710	
Transporting Prisoners	580	
Miscellaneous	374	
Capital Outlay-		
Vehicles	6,891	
Debt Service:		
State Advancement	55,000	
Notes	17,250	
Interest	 433	
Total Expenditures		\$ 297,398

MONROE COUNTY

JERRY GEE, SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Net Revenues Less: Statutory Maximum		\$ 58,016 67,071
Fee Account Deficit Payment of Personal Funds By Sheriff - January 13, 2006 March 7, 2006 \$	7,570 1.485	(9,055) 9,055
Balance Due Fiscal Court at Completion of Audit	1,100	\$ 0

MONROE COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT

December 31, 2005

Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Fund Accounting

A fee official uses a fund to report on the results of operations. A fund is a separate accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain government functions or activities.

A fee official uses a fund for fees to account for activities for which the government desires periodic determination of the excess of revenues over expenditures to facilitate management control, accountability, and compliance with laws.

B. Basis of Accounting

KRS 64.820 directs the fiscal court to collect any amount, including excess fees, due from the Sheriff as determined by the audit. KRS 134.310 requires the Sheriff to settle excess fees with the fiscal court at the time he files his final settlement with the fiscal court.

The financial statement has been prepared on a regulatory basis of accounting, which demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky and is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Under this regulatory basis of accounting revenues and expenditures are generally recognized when cash is received or disbursed with the exception of accrual of the following items (not all-inclusive) at December 31 that may be included in the excess fees calculation:

- Interest receivable
- Collection on accounts due from others for 2005 services
- Reimbursements for 2005 activities
- Tax commissions due from December tax collections
- Payments due other governmental entities for payroll
- Payments due vendors for goods or services provided in 2005

The measurement focus of a fee official is upon excess fees. Remittance of excess fees is due to the County Treasurer in the subsequent year.

C. Cash and Investments

At the direction of the fiscal court, KRS 66.480 authorizes the Sheriff's office to invest in the following, including but not limited to, obligations of the United States and of its agencies and instrumentalities, obligations and contracts for future delivery or purchase of obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, obligations of any corporation of the United States government, bonds or certificates of indebtedness of this state, and certificates of deposit issued by or other interest-bearing accounts of any bank or savings and loan institution which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or which are collateralized, to the extent uninsured, by any obligation permitted by KRS 41.240(4).

MONROE COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Note 2. Employee Retirement System

The county officials and employees have elected to participate in the County Employees Retirement System (CERS), pursuant to KRS 78.530 administered by the Board of Trustees of the Kentucky Retirement Systems. This is a cost-sharing, multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan that covers all eligible full-time employees and provides for retirement, disability, and death benefits to plan members.

Benefit contributions and provisions are established by statute. Nonhazardous covered employees are required to contribute 5.0 percent of their salary to the plan. The county's contribution rate for nonhazardous employees was 7.34 percent for the first six months and 8.48 percent for the last six months of the year.

Benefits fully vest on reaching five years of service for nonhazardous employees. Aspects of benefits for nonhazardous employees include retirement after 27 years of service or age 65.

Historical trend information pertaining to CERS' progress in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due is presented in the Kentucky Retirement Systems' annual financial report which is a matter of public record. This report may be obtained by writing the Kentucky Retirement Systems, 1260 Louisville Road, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-6124, or by telephone at (502) 564-4646.

Note 3. Deposits

The Sheriff maintained deposits of public funds with depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) as required by KRS 66.480(1)(d). According to KRS 41.240(4), the depository institution should pledge or provide sufficient collateral which, together with FDIC insurance, equals or exceeds the amount of public funds on deposit at all times. In order to be valid against the FDIC in the event of failure or insolvency of the depository institution, this pledge or provision of collateral should be evidenced by an agreement between the Sheriff and the depository institution, signed by both parties, that is (a) in writing, (b) approved by the board of directors of the depository institution or its loan committee, which approval must be reflected in the minutes of the board or committee, and (c) an official record of the depository institution.

Custodial Credit Risk - Deposits

Custodial credit risk is the risk that in the event of a depository institution failure, the Sheriff's deposits may not be returned. The Sheriff follows the requirements of KRS 41.240(4) and does not have a deposit policy for custodial risk. As of December 31, 2005, all deposits were covered by FDIC insurance or a properly executed collateral security agreement.

MONROE COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT December 31, 2005 (Continued)

Note 4. Drug Fund

The Monroe County Sheriff's office established a drug fund in February 1992 with funds received as the result of a drug investigation. These funds were to be used for drug enforcement and education. As of January 1, 2005, the drug fund had a balance of \$29. During calendar year 2005, receipts totaled \$795 and disbursements totaled \$813. As of December 31, 2005, the drug fund balance was \$11.

Note 5. Grants

- A. The Monroe County Sheriff's office was awarded a grant under the Community Oriented Policing Services in Schools Grant Program from the U.S. Department of Justice. These funds were used to hire two additional full-time officers. As of January 1, 2005, the grant fund balance was \$7,663. During 2005, receipts totaled \$63,073 and disbursements totaled \$49,627. As of December 31, 2005, the grant fund balance was \$21,109.
- B. The Monroe County Sheriff's office was awarded a grant under the Pennyrile Grant Program from the U.S. Department of Justice. These funds were deposited into the fee account. During 2005, grant receipts totaled \$659 and were used for drug enforcement.



MONROE COUNTY JERRY GEE, SHERIFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For The Year Ended December 31, 2005

INTERNAL CONTROL - REPORTABLE CONDITIONS:

The Sheriff Deposited \$9,055 To Supplement The Cost Of Operating His Office

The Sheriff deposited personal funds of \$9,055 into the 2005 Fee Account due to additional funds being needed to operate his office. On December 23, 2004, the Fiscal Court approved the Sheriff's 2005 Fee Account budget in the amount of \$330,600. Actual receipts totaled \$355,414 and expenditures totaled \$364,469, resulting in the \$9,055 deficit. No amendments were made to the original budget during the year. In the future, we recommend the Sheriff perform budget to actual comparisons on a monthly basis and request budget amendments when additional revenue is received. The Sheriff may then request the Fiscal Court provide additional discretionary funds in order to operate his office.

Sheriff's Response: None

The Sheriff's Office Lacks Adequate Segregation Of Duties

The Sheriff's office has a lack of segregation of duties. Due to the entity's diversity of official operations, small size and budget restrictions the official has limited options for establishing an adequate segregation of duties. We recommend that the following compensating controls be implemented to offset this internal control weakness:

- The Sheriff should periodically compare a daily bank deposit to the daily checkout sheet and then compare the daily checkout sheet to the receipts ledger. Any differences should be reconciled. He could document this by initialing the bank deposit, daily checkout sheet, and receipts ledger.
- The Sheriff should compare the quarterly financial report to receipts and disbursements ledgers for accuracy. The Sheriff should also compare the salaries listed on the quarterly report to the individual earnings records. Any differences should be reconciled. The Sheriff could document this by initialing the quarterly financial report.
- The Sheriff should periodically compare invoices to payments. The Sheriff could document this by initialing the invoices.
- The Sheriff should periodically compare the bank reconciliation to the balance in the checkbook. Any differences should be reconciled. The Sheriff could document this by initialing the bank reconciliation and the balance in the checkbook.

Sheriff's Response: None

INTERNAL CONTROL - MATERIAL WEAKNESS:

None

MONROE COUNTY JERRY GEE, SHERIFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS For The Year Ended December 31, 2005 (Continued)

PRIOR YEAR:

In the prior year audit report, the Auditor of Public Accounts made the following comments and recommendations:

- The Sheriff Should Require Depository Institution To Pledge Or Provide Sufficient Collateral To Protect Deposits
- Lacks Adequate Segregation Of Duties

The first finding has been corrected; the second finding has not and is repeated in the current year audit report.

REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS



The Honorable Wilbur Graves, Monroe County Judge/Executive Honorable Jerry Gee, Monroe County Sheriff Members of the Monroe County Fiscal Court

> Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards

We have audited the statement of revenues, expenditures, and excess fees - regulatory basis of the Monroe County Sheriff for the year ended December 31, 2005, and have issued our report thereon dated March 7, 2006. The Sheriff's financial statement is prepared in accordance with a basis of accounting other than generally accepted accounting principles. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Monroe County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statement and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting. However, we noted certain matters involving the internal control over financial reporting and its operation that we consider to be reportable conditions. Reportable conditions involve matters coming to our attention relating to significant deficiencies in the design or operation of the internal control over financial reporting that, in our judgment, could adversely affect the entity's ability to record, process, summarize, and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the financial statement. Reportable conditions are described in the accompanying comments and recommendations.

- The Sheriff Deposited \$9,055 To Supplement The Cost Of Operating His Office
- The Sheriff's Office Lacks Adequate Segregation Of Duties

A material weakness is a reportable condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that misstatements caused by error or fraud in amounts that would be material in relation to the financial statement being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. Our consideration of the internal control over financial reporting would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be reportable conditions and, accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all reportable conditions that are also considered to be material weaknesses. However, we believe that neither of the reportable conditions described above is a material weakness.



Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards (Continued)

Compliance And Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Monroe County Sheriff's financial statement for the year ended December 31, 2005, is free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance and other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management and the Kentucky Governor's Office for Local Development and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Crit Luallen

Auditor of Public Accounts

Audit fieldwork completed - March 7, 2006